

***Village of Barrington  
Plan Commission  
Minutes Summary***

Date: May 10, 2005

Time: 7:00 p.m.

Location: Village Board Room  
200 South Hough Street  
Barrington, Illinois

In Attendance: Anna Bush, Chairperson  
Harry Burroughs, Commissioner  
Daniel Hogan, Commissioner  
Ed McCauley, Commissioner

Staff Members: Paul Evans, Assistant Director of Planning

***Call to Order***

Ms. Bush called the meeting to order at 7:02 p.m.

Ms. Bush swore in Daniel Hogan and Harry Burroughs as Plan Commission members.

Roll call noted the following: Anna Bush, Chairperson, present; Ruth Schlossberg, Vice Chair, absent; Harry Burroughs, present; Richard Ehrle, absent; John Patsey, absent; Daniel Hogan, present; Ed McCauley, present.

There being a quorum, the meeting proceeded.

***Chairperson's Remarks***

None

***Old Business***

None

***New Business***

**PC 05-06:** CVS Pharmacy (Planned Development Amendment) – 101 South Northwest Highway  
**Petitioner:** G.B. Illinois 2 LLC

Ms. Bush announced the order of the agenda and swore in all who would be speaking on the petition.

Ronald Best, attorney, presented the petition. Mr. Best stated that the petitioner is proposing to amend an existing special use/planned development (Ordinance No. 04-3197) to relocate the access drive on Main Street fifteen (15) feet to the west, relocate the Main Street ground sign and parking field fifteen (15) feet to the west, increase the number of parking spaces from 53 to 60 and make associated revisions to the Landscaping, Lighting, Signage and Engineering Plans. The CVS plan, approved in November of 2004, proposed to acquire and redevelop five properties at the southeast intersection of Northwest Highway and Main Street into a 24-hour CVS pharmacy with a drive-through.

Ms. Bush asked for the staff report.

Mr. Evans stated that the original proposal was approved by the Village Board on November 8, 2004 (Ordinance No. 04-3197). The site is currently occupied by several retail shops (Scandinavian Furniture,

Dry Cleaners, Bedding Experts), a vacant office building and a single-family dwelling unit. The petitioner is proposing to demolish all of the existing structures and make improvements to the site including, but not limited to a landscaped entry feature at the corner including benches and a community sign, a 13,013 square foot pharmacy with a drive-through facility, and new signage, lighting, landscaping and improved traffic circulation.

The petitioner is seeking to amend the special use/planned development to comply with the Illinois Department of Transportation's permit requirements that require a lot line agreement with the adjacent neighbor, if any portion of the proposed improvements crosses the imaginary extension of the lot line. The petitioner was not able to reach a lot line agreement with the neighbor so the petitioner is moving the access drive fifteen (15) feet to the west to eliminate the lot line agreement requirement.

Staff finds that all eighteen standards have been met and therefore recommends that the Plan Commission approve PC 05-06 to the Board of Trustees subject to the following conditions:

1. The proposed ground sign shall be set back at least seven (7) feet from the east property line and five (5) feet from the north property line. The adjacent residential property on Main Street shall be adequately screened from the light of the ground sign.
2. The Petitioner must secure an IDOT permit for this development. Staff has received the Illinois Department of Transportation's (IDOT) comments relative to this project. IDOT recommends limiting the Main Street access to right-in, right-out and left-in access only.
3. The Petitioner shall place a non-mountable median on the Main Street access driveway to prevent left-turn movements onto Main Street from the site.
4. The Petitioner must ensure that they meet the Village's light standards abutting the right-of-way and adjacent to residential properties. The Petitioner shall only be allowed twenty (20) foot pole height for light standards if the light source has a total cut-off of an angle less than ninety (90) degrees.

Mr. Best advised that the green post cards were submitted.

Ms. Bush asked for public comment, there was none.

*Mr. Burroughs made a motion to approve PC 05-06. Mr. Hogan seconded the motion.*

*Roll Call Vote:*

*Mr. Burroughs – yes*

*Mr. McCauley -yes*

*Ms. Bush – yes*

*Mr. Hogan -yes*

*Motion carried.*

#### ***Approval of Minutes***

*Mr. McCauley made a motion to approve the minutes of April 12, 2005 as presented. Mr. Burroughs seconded. Voice vote recorded all ayes. Motion carried.*

**PC 05-03: Shops at Flint Creek (Special Use/Planned Development) – 500 N. Hough Street**  
**Petitioner: HW Barrington Partners, LLC**

Ms. Bush swore in all who would be speaking on the petition.

Mr. Todd Berlinghof, partner for Hamilton Partners, presented the petition. The petitioner is requesting approval to demolish the existing Carton Craft building and construct a maximum 58,000 square feet retail shopping center and a financial institution with drive-thru facilities as an outlot along with associated landscaping, signage and site engineering at the address listed above. The applicant is seeking special use approval for a financial institution with drive-thru facilities and two (2) restaurants with drive-thru facilities. The applicant is requesting to rezone the property from M-1 Limited Manufacturing to B-4 Village Center Business District.

Ms. Bush asked if fencing is proposed by the monument around the waterfall.

Mr. Berlinghof replied that no fencing will be installed.

Mr. Burroughs asked if a bank will be on the site.

Mr. Berlinghof replied that the proposed bank will be constructed per the Village's approval.

Mr. Burroughs commented he is concerned with expansion of the proposed bank.

*Pat Hogan, Vice President for Governmental Operations for Bank of America*

Pat Hogan, Vice President for Governmental Operations for Bank of America responded that this facility should be sufficient for the services they will provide.

Mr. McCauley asked if two separate facilities are preferred than one bank facility.

Ms. Hogan responded that it doesn't make a difference; however, it is preferred to have one site.

Mr. Burroughs asked the petitioner to address the comments from the Architectural Review Commission.

Mr. Berlinghof responded that the Architectural Review Commission did ask for more variety in design and materials so the petitioner is looking to add variety, but on the whole however; they seemed to approve of the concept.

Mr. Burroughs commented that he would prefer something a little more traditional.

Mr. Berlinghof responded that the style was chosen to attract customers.

Mr. Burroughs asked if the Architectural Review Commission suggested the possibility of breaking up the outlot. He noted that the commission has previously recommended against strip malls.

Mr. Berlinghof responded that breaking up the outlots would hinder parking and be more expensive.

Ms. Bush commented that she would prefer using the creek as a feature point. Ms. Bush asked if the parking lot was designed to include the view of the creek.

Mr. Berlinghof replied that the creek is lower in elevation than the parking lot and is difficult to view from the parking lot.

Ms. Bush stated that she agreed with Mr. Burroughs comments regarding the building and she asked what part of the development will attract customers.

Mr. Berlinghof replied that the businesses themselves will generate customers.

Ms. Bush commented that she is concerned with the traffic flow especially based on her experience with the traffic from the Carton Craft building.

Mr. Berlinghof replied that traffic from this retail site will not be as dense as traffic generated from the old Carton Craft site; however a traffic officer may be needed during peak hours.

Ms. Bush asked for Mr. Berlinghof to elaborate on the water feature.

Mr. Berlinghof referred to the drawing to detail the monument sign water feature as well as to note where the catch basin will be located.

Mr. Hogan asked for a list of similar developments from Hamilton Partners for a better assessment.

Mr. Berlinghof noted locations in Westmont and Elk Grove Village.

Mr. Burroughs stated his concern with taking business away from other local shops.

Mr. Berlinghof responded that they are looking at established businesses rather than taking business away from local businesses.

Mr. McCauley remarked that proposed streetscape and setback does not blend well with the existing buildings in the area.

Mr. Berlinghof commented that the business would not operate well under the existing conditions.

Mr. Burroughs asked if the facade could be altered.

Mr. Berlinghof replied that due to limited size, it would be difficult.

Mr. Burroughs suggested that maybe a small park area concept could be used.

Mr. Berlinghof responded there is a park nearby. A bridge will be installed to connect the project to the park so that park goers will have access to the businesses.

Ms. Bush asked where the HVAC units will be located.

Mr. Berlinghof replied they will be located on top of the building behind a parapet wall.

Ms. Bush asked for the staff report.

Mr. Evans stated that the petitioner is requesting approval for the purpose of demolishing the existing Carton Craft building and constructing a maximum 58,000 square foot retail shopping center and a financial institution with drive-thru facilities as an outlot along with associated landscaping, signage and site engineering. The applicant is seeking special use approval of a financial institution with drive-thru facilities and two (2) restaurants with drive-thru facilities. The applicant is requesting to rezone the property from M-1 Limited Manufacturing to B-4 Village Center Business District. The applicant is seeking the following exceptions: 1) Special Uses on First Floor (Chapter 7, Section 7.5 Subsection D); 2) Minimum Yard Requirements (Chapter 7, Section 7.5 Subsection H); 3) Maximum Building Height (Chapter 7, Section 7.5 Subsection J); 4) Building Size Regulations (Chapter 7, Section 7.5 Subsection K); 5) Minimum Building Width (Chapter 7, Section 7.5 Subsection L); 6) Off-Street Parking and Loading Requirements (Chapter 7, Section 7.5 Subsection P & Chapter 4, Part II); 7) Signage (Chapter 4, Part IV, Section 4.13) on the property legally described above.

The petitioner is seeking a special use/planned development subdivision to complete these improvements. The development will require exceptions for minimum yard requirements, maximum building height, signage, off street parking and loading requirements, minimum building width, and building size regulations. The petitioner has already appeared before the Architectural Review Commission for a preliminary meeting. The ARC noted that the proposed changes represented an overall improvement to the area. They made comments relative to the elevations (more variation to the front elevations and classical detailing), building materials (using standard-size brick, more substantial roofing materials) and signage for the property. The petitioner will appear for a final ARC meeting after the Plan Commission makes its recommendation to the Board of Trustees.

The petitioner is asking for approval on several plan options. They have included separate site plans and elevations for Plans A and B. The developer is seeking final plan development approval for Plan A, which consists of a 47,600 square foot shopping center with two (2) drive-through uses and an outlot containing

4,547 square foot bank with three (3) drive-thrus, subject to ARC approval. The developer is seeking final plan development approval for Plan B, which consists of a 6,000 square feet future expansion of the south retail building to create a total shopping center square footage of 53,600 square feet not including the bank outlot, subject to ARC approval. The developer is seeking preliminary planned development approval for Plan C, which consists of a maximum 58,000 square foot retail shopping center consisting of a maximum 38,850 square foot south retail building and a 19,150 square foot north retail building with a minimum of 268 parking spaces not including the bank outlot.

Staff finds that all eighteen standards have been met and recommends that the Plan Commission approve PC 05-03 subject to the following conditions:

1. Final planned development approval of Plan A which consists of 47,600 square feet of retail space (19,150 square foot north retail building and 28,450 square foot south retail building), 242 parking spaces and final site plan special use approval of a 4,547 square foot financial institution with three (3) drive-through facilities [pending final approval of signage, elevations and landscaping by the Architectural Review Commission (ARC)].
2. Final planned development approval of Plan B which consists 53,600 square feet of retail space (19,150 square foot north retail building and 34,450 square foot south retail building) and requires final elevation and landscape approval by the ARC, 268 parking spaces and final site plan special use approval of a 4,547 square foot financial institution with three (3) drive-through facilities (requires final approval of signage, elevations and landscaping by the ARC).
3. Provided that the Petitioner presents a feasibly layout, preliminary plan approval of Plan C which would entail 58,000 square feet of retail space (19,150 square foot north retail building and 38,850 square foot south retail building), 268 parking spaces plus an additional land bank of parking spaces equal to fourteen (14) spaces to be located south of the south retail building (requires plan review by the Plan Commission and ARC) and final site plan special use approval of a 4,547 square foot financial institution with three (3) drive-through facilities (requires final approval of signage, elevations and landscaping by the ARC).
4. Rezoning of petitioner's property from M-1 Limited Manufacturing to B-4 Village Center Business District.
5. The following uses are permitted on the first floor as long as the total square footage of these special permitted uses does not exceed 8,000 square feet.
  - a. Physical Therapy with sport training
  - b. Dry Cleaners
  - c. Massage Therapy as part of a day spa or rehabilitation clinic
  - d. Medical and Dental offices
6. The petitioner is requesting special use approval of a financial institution with three (3) drive-through facilities. All financial institutions are special uses in the B-4 Village Center District. In keeping with the Village's retail preference policy, staff is reluctant to recommend approval of another facility for a financial institution with an existing facility already in the village. Staff is requesting that the proposed bank (Bank of America) agree to consolidate its Barrington operations either in the proposed bank building on site or as part of the proposed shopping center so additional retail locations are available on Main Street. If the Bank of America Main Street business is relocated to the proposed shopping center, staff recommends that the square footage necessary to accomplish the relocation not be counted against the allotted 8,000 square feet of permitted special uses.
7. The required rear access corridor for buildings that are more than seventy-five (75) feet in width is not provided for in the petitioner's plans. Staff supports this exception as it provides for the most efficient layout, is consistent with other commercial shopping centers and parking is located both in front and behind the building.
8. Buildings in excess of seventy-five (75) feet of street frontage width are required to provide one (1) rear pedestrian access corridor a minimum of eight (8) feet in width. This requirement is targeted at businesses along Main Street where the main parking field is located behind the building. Staff supports this exception as parking is located both in front and behind the building.
9. The width of buildings shall not be less than eighty (80) percent of the lot width to promote a pedestrian friendly façade and a continuous building line. The building width requirement is also a requirement that seeks to create traditional downtown facades where buildings are constructed near the

street. Staff supports this exception as it provides the most efficient layout of the site and is consistent with the design of other commercial shopping centers in Barrington.

10. The maximum building height for the B-4 Village Center District is thirty-eight (38) feet. The petitioner is requesting a one-and-a-half (1.5) foot height exception to thirty-nine feet, six inches (39' 6") for the architectural feature (turret) on the north retail building. The principal structures are all below the maximum building height for this zoning district. Staff supports this exception because it adds an architectural feature to the building while all principal buildings are below the maximum building height.
11. Plans indicate that the anchor tenant for the south retail building has requested wall signage which is to be 270 square feet and twenty-four (24) feet high when only 100 square feet and twenty-three (23) square feet is allowed by the Zoning Ordinance. Staff is supportive of a sign area exception of two hundred (200) square feet for the main anchor based on the fact that the sign is over 300 feet from Hough Street and is perpendicular to Hough Street. Staff believes the twenty-three (23) foot height should remain. The ARC will need to approve the final design of the sign.
12. Staff is supportive of the following Master Sign Plan elements and would allow the petitioner to use internally illuminated channel letters as long as they were not located on a raceway and the petitioner limited the range of colors to be used on the signs. Staff would support all non-corner large tenants with frontage of over forty-one (41) feet to be allowed a sign area of 100 square feet and would be allowed a maximum height of twenty-three (23) feet. Staff would support all medium tenants with frontage greater than nineteen (19) and less than forty-one (41) feet to be allowed a sign area of eighty-five (85) square feet and a maximum height of twenty (20) feet. Staff would support all small tenants with frontage less than nineteen (19) be allowed a sign area of fifty-five (55) square feet and a maximum height of eighteen (18) feet. The southeast and northeast corner buildings would be allowed a sign area of eighty-five (85) square feet on both the front and corner of the building and a maximum height of nineteen and half (19.5) feet.
13. The proposed main ground sign located twenty-five (25) feet from Hough Street is incorporated into the architectural feature of a waterfall. While the monument-style sign is allowed to be sixty-two (62) square feet, the petitioner is proposing approximately ninety-four (94) square feet two-sided sign. Staff is supportive of this exception because of the uniqueness of the ground sign and that it meets the required eleven (11) feet height requirement provided the petitioner use individual channel letters, white letters on the red brick for the tenants and black letters for the name of the shopping center and ground lighting instead of internal illumination.
14. The petitioner is also asking for a second ground sign to be used as a directory sign for their smaller tenants. The proposed directory sign would be six and half (6.5) feet high and has a total area of eighteen (18) square feet. The directory sign will have space for seven (7) tenant panels, is one-sided and is internally illuminated. Staff would support this second ground sign provided the petitioner select a particular color range and use a consistent font.
15. The B-4 Village Center District requires that all parking and loading be in the rear yard only. The petitioner is proposing to have parking in the front and interior yards. Given the design of this center and its location relative to Hough Street, staff supports this exception for this shopping center.
16. Plan C (ultimate build-out) will require 290 parking spaces for the 58,000 square feet of retail space. The petitioner is proposing 268 parking spaces leaving a deficit of twenty-two (22) spaces or roughly 7.6% upon ultimate build-out. Staff is supportive of this exception provided the financial institution (bank) agrees to a perpetual shared parking agreement with the shopping center. In addition, staff requests that the petitioner show a land bank of fourteen (14) parking space behind the south retail building that the petitioner can install on their own or the Village can require the petitioner to install up to fourteen (14) additional parking spaces should non-holiday parking be a problem at this development in the opinion of the Chief Administrative Officer of the Village. Staff is supportive of a parking exception because the sheer number of parking spaces provided allows a bit of flexibility from the required number and the expected mix of retail, office and food uses on the site should be compatible as complementary land uses.
17. The financial institution is required to have seven (7) stacking spaces per drive-through facility or total of twenty-one (21) stacking spaces according to the Zoning Ordinance. Staff believes that sixteen (16) stacking spaces are sufficient for the financial institution. Staff is supportive of this stacking exception provided the petitioner show on the plan stacking for sixteen (16) vehicles spaced twenty-two (22) feet

apart from front bumper to front bumper and that the stacking does not interfere with the backing of parked vehicles.

18. The Petitioner shall present a final plat of subdivision to the Village Board within sixty (60) days of Village Board approval that accurately depicts the financial institution outlot and required right-of-way dedication related to a right-turn lane on Hough Street.
19. The Petitioner must secure an IDOT permit for this development. Staff has received the Illinois Department of Transportation's (IDOT) comments relative to this project. IDOT recommends full access onto Hough Street and right-turn lane and left-turn lane on Hough Street. Staff concurs with this traffic configuration.
20. The Petitioner shall provide a streetscape plan for the Hough Street frontage consistent with the Village's Master Center Plan.
21. The Petitioner shall provide a truck and emergency vehicle maneuvering plan that will correctly show the turning movement of these vehicles within the approved driving aisles. Please note that no interior setback is required along the E J & E railroad tracks.
22. Revise photometrics to ensure that 1.0 foot-candle is the maximum illumination along the east and south property lines. Please note that a twenty (20) foot pole height is only allowed if the light source has a total cut-off of less than 90 degrees.
23. Revise the site plan to reflect only seven (7) handicapped parking spaces are required for the retail center and only one (1) handicapped parking space is required for the financial institution.
24. Staff recommends that the Petitioner evaluate the need for additional trash enclosure for the south retail building and that the existing trash enclosure be relocated next to the building and screened. The garbage enclosure shall be presented to the ARC for approval.
25. Provide a note on the site plan regarding how the financial institution trash will be removed from the site.
26. Revise the financial institution site plan to show stacking for sixteen (16) vehicles spaced twenty-two (22) feet apart that will not conflict with the exiting of parked vehicles and a drive-around lane. This revised plan must be approved by the Chief Administrative Officer of the Village.
27. Clearly delineate on the site plan the paved area from the grass area and sidewalks.
28. Delineate on the Plan C site plan the area to be land banked and number of parking spaces that area will accommodate. Label the parking on Plan A south of the south retail building as future parking expansion and remove the word "future" from the Plan C south parking area.
29. The north retail drive-through food use will not be allowed without a parking and stacking study approved by the Chief Administrative Officer of the Village to ensure that it does not obstruct site traffic. The Village shall have the right to require additional parking to be installed if the parking for the food uses creates a parking shortage on the site.
30. The Petitioner shall ensure that no signage on the site obstructs a driver's visibility or blocks sight lines.
31. The petitioner shall provide complete fire suppression for the building. Separate fire and domestic water lines will be required by the Village of Barrington.
32. Provide a letter of coordination from the Park District that acknowledges where the petitioner's bike path will connect to the Park District's site at Langendorf Park.
33. The Petitioner shall submit a creek restoration plan for both sides of Flint Creek up to Hough Street that must be reviewed and approved by the Director of Public Works.
34. All planting of trees, shrubs, ground cover, perennials and sod shall be performed at the appropriate season.
35. The proposed financial institution shall achieve a seventy-five (75) percent screen of the parking lot perimeter and the parking lot islands shall contain at least two (2) deciduous shade trees.
36. Final landscaping plans shall be submitted to the Village of Barrington for approval.
37. The Petitioner shall comply with the engineering and landscape comments noted on the Technical Review of March 21, 2005 and April 28, 2005 to the satisfaction of the Director of Public Works.

Ms. Bush asked if the engineering consultant had concerns with the traffic generated from this project.

Mr. Evans responded that the consultants did not feel that the traffic generated from this site will not provide additional traffic.

Mr. McCauley asked if the Illinois Department of Transportation will allow a traffic officer to direct traffic at this site.

Ms. Bush noted that it has been done previously.

Ms. Bush asked for clarification on the drive-thru circulation.

Mr. Berlinghof referred to the drawings to demonstrate the traffic circulation.

Ms. Bush commented that she has concerns with the north drive-thru traffic circulation.

Mr. Berlinghof responded that traffic is an issue as well making sure that a suitable food facility is located at that location.

Ms. Bush asked where the disposal sites will be located.

Mr. Berlinghof displayed the sites on the proposed plans.

Ms. Bush asked if the fire chief had any concerns with the single-point access.

Mr. Evans replied that they did not receive any comments from the fire chief, but he will check again.

Mr. Burroughs asked who will be parking in the supplemental parking strip.

Mr. Evans replied that this area will probably be used by employees.

Mr. Burroughs asked about the restoration of the creek.

Mr. Evans replied that a plan will be developed by the petitioner and approved by staff.

Ms. Bush commented that much of the vegetation along the creek should not be destroyed.

Mr. Berlinghof advised that much of the plan is to remove harmful plants such as buckthorn as well as falling trees.

Mr. Burroughs asked if any areas will be re-graded.

Mr. Berlinghof stated that some areas will need to be re-graded.

Mr. McCauley asked staff about the park districts comments.

Mr. Evans responded that they will be meeting as soon as possible.

Ms. Bush asked staff if they are waiting for more recommendations from the traffic consultant.

Mr. Evans replied yes, specifically the traffic circulations.

Mr. Burroughs asked staff if the petitioner is required to work on the restoration of the creek.

Mr. Evans stated that the creek is part of their property and therefore is included in the landscaping requirements.

Mr. Burroughs asked if there is sidewalk along Route 59.



Mr. Evans replied that a sidewalk is included in the plan.

Mr. McCauley asked if a sign plan is available with drawings to scale.

Mr. Berlinghof replied yes and referred to the drawings.

Ms. Bush asked for public comment, there was none.

Ms. Bush asked for the commission's comments.

Mr. McCauley responded that he would like to review the Architectural Reviews Commission's comments.

Mr. Burroughs commented they would like to review ARC's comments as well.

Mr. McCauley commented that he would prefer more creativity in the design and have the proposal meet more of the Village's Zoning requirements.

Mr. Burroughs commented that he would prefer more of a 'Barrington look' to the style of the development.

Mr. Hogan commented that he is impressed with the developer's commitment to the project, however, he still has concerns with the traffic and would like to see a more detailed traffic study provided by the developer.

Mr. Berlinghof stated that the traffic will vary and due to the type of businesses proposed for this site.

*Mr. George Wight, Wight Consulting*

Mr. Wight noted that the type of businesses proposed was included in the traffic report and the projections were taken from the ITE report.

Mr. Hogan asked for clarification from the staff report regarding the traffic study.

Mr. Evans read comments from the engineering consultant.

Mr. Burroughs remarked that although this project will not provide a significant increase in traffic, there is traffic congestion in that area which could affect the amount of customers visiting the area.

Mr. Berlinghof replied that traffic enforcement will be needed as soon as the project opens.

Ms. Bush commented that she would like some consolidation with the bank facility and has great concerns with the north drive-thru; specifically it's traffic circulation and the types of retail establishments which will be using this site. She would like to limit the number of shops on the site and have the signage be more consistent. Ms. Bush noted she also has concerns with the wetland cleanup issue.

*Mr. Burroughs made a motion to continue PC 05-03 until May 31<sup>st</sup>. Mr. McCauley seconded the motion.*

*Roll Call Vote:*

*Mr. Burroughs – yes*

*Ms. Bush – yes*

*Mr. Hogan - yes*

*Mr. McCauley - yes*

*Motion carried.*

### ***Planner's Report***

Mr. Evans provided information on future cases.

***Adjournment***

Mr. Burroughs moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. McCauley seconded the motion. Voice note recorded all ayes. The motion carried.

Meeting adjourned at 9:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Paula Emerson  
Recording Secretary

---

Ms. Bush, Chairperson  
Plan Commission